

REMARKS

Claims 20-32 are presently pending and stand rejected. Each of the foregoing claims stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious from the combination of Edler in view of Lempel. Continued Examination is respectfully requested.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite, among other limitations, “a memory for storing results of the Huffman decoding of the frame of encoded audio data, the results of the prediction decoding of the encoded audio frame, and the results of intensity coupling the frame of encoded audio data, wherein the results of the prediction decoding for the frame of encoded audio data at least partially overwrite the results of the Huffman decoding of the frame of encoded audio data, and wherein the results of the intensity coupling for the frame of encoded audio data at least partially overwrite the results of the prediction decoding of the frame of encoded audio data”.

Examiner has indicated that “Edler fails to teach a memory for storing results of the one or more audio decoding functions comprising prediction decoding on the frame of encoded data. Final Office Action at 3. Assignee respectfully submits that Edler does not teach the foregoing limitation.

However, Examiner has indicated that “(Lempel Col. 6 lines 55-64) teaches wherein the memory stores the results of bitstream demultiplexing the encoded audio data over at least a portion of the results of the one or more audio decoding functions comprising prediction decoding (Lempel Col. 6 lines 55-64 & Fig. 1)” and that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention a memory that stores the results of bitstream demultiplexing encoded audio data over at least a portion of the results of the one or more audio decoding functions comprising prediction decoding for the purposes of significant overlap, wherein a portion of the data is preserved can continuously be made without effecting cache memory transactions.

Assignee first submits that Lempel deals with video data while the claimed invention deals with audio data. Assignee calls Examiner’s attention to Lempel, Col. 6, Lines 45-50, stating that “In this regard, the cache memory control unit 27 causing the right half (R1) of the first macroblock (MB1) in the first row of the compressed video stream 13 to be stored in subblock 0 and the left half (L1) of the first macroblock (MB1) in the first row of the compressed *video* in to be stored in subblock 1.”

Assignee respectfully submits that Col. 6, Lines 55-64 pertains to “compressed video” as opposed to audio data. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully submits that the combination of Edler and Lempel does not teach “a memory for storing results of the Huffman decoding of the frame of encoded *audio* data, the results of the prediction decoding of the encoded *audio* frame, and the results of intensity coupling the frame of encoded *audio* data, wherein the results of the prediction decoding for the frame of encoded *audio* data at least partially overwrite the results of the Huffman decoding of the frame of encoded *audio* data, and wherein the results of the intensity coupling for the frame of encoded *audio* data at least partially overwrite the results of the prediction decoding of the frame of encoded *audio* data”

Assignee notes that Lempel’s teaching regarding macroblocks could not be applied to audio data due to the inherent differences between audio and video data. For example, macroblocks of video data are spatially two-dimensional, e.g., “the prediction area is a 16x8 area”, while audio data is not. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 20 and 26, as well as their respective dependent claims.

Furthermore, it is also noted that Lempel teaches that *different* macroblocks overwrite other macroblocks, .e.g., “the second macroblock (MB2) is retrieved and the cache memory control unit 27 causes the right half (R2) of the second macroblock (MB2) to be cached in subblock 1 overwriting the left half (L1) of the first macroblock (MB1)”. In contrast, claim 20 as now amended recites that “wherein the results of the prediction decoding for the frame of encoded audio data at least partially overwrite the results of the Huffman decoding of the frame of encoded audio data, and wherein the results of the intensity coupling for the frame of encoded audio data at least partially overwrite the results of the prediction decoding of the frame of encoded audio data”. Claim 26 is amended to recite, “wherein the memory stores the outputs of the second audio decoding circuit on the frame over at least a portion of the results of the first audio decoding circuit on the frame”. It is noted that in the claim language, Huffman decoding/prediction decoding results of the same frame are overwritten.

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 20 and 26, as well as the rejections to claims 21-25, and 27-32.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that each of the pending claims are allowable and Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: January 26, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100